

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of CHYNIQUE MYESHA ROGERS,  
DREANA SHANTEL ROGERS, and AVIONNA  
LA'NAE ROGERS, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,  
  
Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CHQUITA ROGERS,  
  
Respondent-Appellant,

and

JOHN DUNN and ANTONIO REDMOND,  
  
Respondents.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
January 26, 2001

No. 226176  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Juvenile Division  
LC No. 96-347265

Before: Zahra, P.J., and Smolenski and Gage, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant, Chquita Rogers, appeals as of right from an order terminating her parental rights to the three minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(ii), (c)(i), (g) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(b)(ii), (c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm.

The juvenile court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 455 NW2d 161 (1989). Substantial evidence suggested Chynique was sexually abused by a cousin during unsupervised visits with respondent-appellant. Testimony at the termination hearing suggested that despite being informed of the allegations of abuse, respondent-appellant continued to allow the cousin to have contact with Chynique and Dreana. Furthermore, despite three years of services under her first parent/agency treatment plan, respondent-appellant did not comply with the requirements that she acquire her GED, complete domestic violence counseling, and maintain a drug-free home and lifestyle. The record suggests that respondent-appellant did

not comply with several drug screen requests and tested positive for drugs four times. Respondent-appellant's conduct suggests that she would be unable to provide proper care for the children within a reasonable time and would not protect the children from future harm if they were returned to her custody.

Furthermore, there is not clear evidence, on the whole record, that termination was not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 354, 364-365; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Accordingly, the juvenile court did not clearly err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Brian K. Zahra

/s/ Michael R. Smolenski

/s/ Hilda R. Gage